

Appl. No. 10/754,428

Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

Docket No.: 022.0140

**REMARKS**

This is a complete and timely response to the Office Action mailed on April 19, 2006 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, in which the Examiner rejected all pending claims 1-29. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the instant amendment and following remarks. 8, 13, and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 10, 14, and 26 have been amended. As a result, claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-26, and 28-29 remain pending (3 independent claims, 26 claims total). No new matter has been added.

**I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-21, and 23-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0266465 (the “Zegelin reference”) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0023621 (the “Sugar reference”). Claims 3-6, 11-12, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Zegelin reference in view of the Sugar reference in further view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0209579 (the “Vaidyanathan reference”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The independent claims – claims 1, 10, and 26 – have been amended to include the elements of original claim 13, which the Examiner objected to, but otherwise indicated was allowable. Specifically, claims 13-14 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

The claims have been amended to recite “wherein associating the portion of the transmission matrix with the predetermined location comprises associating the portion of the transmission matrix with the predetermined location using a portion of at least one stored transmission matrix, and wherein the portion of the at least one stored transmission matrix is associated with the predetermined location.” Neither the Zegelin, Sugar, nor Vaidyanathan references recite this element.

Accordingly, as the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or otherwise disclose each and every element of the claims as amended, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejections be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/754,428

Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

Docket No.: 022.0140

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorneys at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER &amp; LORENZ

Dated: 6/30/06, 2006By: 

Daniel R. Pote  
Reg. No. 43,011  
(480) 385-5060